

was apparently inconsistent with the statements of Haggai and Zechariah, the contemporary prophets, who say nothing about the foundations being laid at an earlier time, but speak as if no work whatever had been done on the temple until the time of Darius. Schröder's contention made little impression until it was revived in 1890 by Kuenen, the famous professor at Leyden. It then provoked a controversy which was in progress at the time of his death. The controversy was not allowed to drop, but was taken up by Kusters, his successor in the chair, and pressed by him to its natural conclusion. Not much has been heard of the matter in England or America, but Kusters' book, entitled "*The Restoration of Israel in the Persian Period*," has made a great noise in Holland and Germany. One does not wonder when it is considered what his conclusions are. Negatively, they may be stated as follows :

- (1) That there was no return of Jewish exiles under Cyrus.
- (2) The temple was not built by returned exiles at all, but by the descendants of those Jews who had been left in the land, and by whom Jerusalem had been re-peopled.
- (3) Zerubbabel and Jeshua were not the leaders of any band of returning exiles, but the official heads of the resident community that had occupied Jerusalem.
- (4) The walls of Jerusalem were likewise rebuilt by this same community under the leadership of Nehemiah.
- (5) That Ezra's arrival at Jerusalem did not take place before Nehemiah's governorship, but only after the temple and the walls had been built, when Nehemiah was governor the second time.

Kusters' book, which appeared in 1895, was followed last year by an essay from Dr. Charles Torrey on "*The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah*," in which he utterly discredits the historical character of these books. According to him, the writer distorts facts deliberately and habitually ; invents chapter after chapter with the greatest